

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-38 are pending. Claims 1-38 are rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 16, 18 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mishra et al. "Security Services Markup Language" (hereinafter "Mishra"). Claims 2, 4-5, 17, 19-20 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishra as applied to claims 1, 16, and 31, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al. (hereinafter "Gupta"). Claims 6-8, 10-15, 21-23, 25-30, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishra in view of Gupta. Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishra in view of Gupta as applied to claims 6 and 21, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029269 to McCarty et al. (hereinafter "McCarty").

Applicants' invention relates to a method, system, apparatus, or computer program product for providing a single-sign-on mechanism within an ASP aggregator service. Each of the independent claims 1, 6, 16, 18 and 31 recite the limitation of an aggregator token that is generated by an ASP aggregator service and sent to a client device after its user has been successfully authenticated during a single-sign-on operation that is provided by the ASP aggregator service. The aggregator token then accompanies any request from the client to aggregated applications within the ASP aggregator service's infrastructure. In various embodiments of the invention, the aggregator token comprises an indication of an address or resource identifier within the ASP aggregator service to which a client/user can be redirected when the client/user needs to be authenticated by the ASP aggregator service.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 16, 18 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or §103 is improper and should be removed. Contrary to Examiner's statements in the Office action, Mishra does not teach the use of an aggregator token. Furthermore, this feature is not disclosed by any of the other art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6, 16, 18 and 31 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Furthermore, all of the pending dependent claims are allowable since they are dependent on allowable base claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
April 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

*/Gary W. Hamilton/*

Gary W. Hamilton  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 31,834